REMARKS

(This is a timely filed substitute or replacement ELECTION offered in response to a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment setting a due date of 15 July 2005 for correction of informalities found in the ELECTION mailed on 1 June 2005 for the above-captioned case. The informality was that the listed claims did not contain all claims and individual parenthetical status identification. An additional error was also discovered, in that Claim 4 was mentioned twice, once as a retained claim and once as a cancelled claim. That error has been corrected: the cancelled Claims are 5 - 6.)

The Specification and Claims have not yet been reviewed for typographical and grammatical errors.

Turning now to the recent action requiring RESTRICTION, applicants elect Group I, consisting of Claims 1 - 4, and have requested that Claims 5 and 6 be withdrawn from consideration, pending their re-introduction in a Continuing case.

The Examiner's letter indicated a further requirement for an election of species in the event that Group I was elected. The rationale for this is not understood, but nevertheless, for to formulate the needed complete Response, applicants elect the purported species of Figure 1.

It is believed that the embodiments of each of Figures 1, 3 and 4 is contained within the breadth and scope of Claim 1. In support of this view, applicants note that Claim 1 requires only that there be at least one "... metallic conductor formed on the insulating substrate, connected at one end to the first terminal, disposed to be adjacent to at least part of the first resistor and having a distributed capacitive coupling thereto selected to compensate for distributed stray capacitance from the first resistor to a circuit ground." This recitation says nothing about the shape of the metallic conductor, nor that there be only one. What it is specific about is that it is connected to the first terminal and adjacent to the first resistor. We can lump these together to say that to say that the claim recites that there be at least a "signal driven stray capacitance killer." Claim 3 adds another such metallic conductor, connected this time to the third terminal and adjacent the second resistor. We can term this a "feedback driven stray capacitance killer." It is noted that Claims 1 and 3 are part of the same Group I, and that whatever would infringe Claim 3 would infringe Claim 1; Claim 3 could have been, in principle, a dependent claim, but issues related to grammar and their own local dependent claims (2 and 4, respectively) got in the way. So it seems proper that Claims 1 - 4 are all in the same Group.

However, Figures 1, 3 and 4 are merely different way of forming the metallic conductor(s) set out in Claims 1 and 3. There is no language in either of Claim 1 or Claim 3 that limits either of them to a 'species' identified by the figures. It seems, therefore, to applicants that there are no species associated with this case .... .

The above is believed to constitute a **complete** response to the requirement for RESTRICTION imposed by the Examiner.

Continued examination is requested, and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Sylvia J. Budak and Joe E. Marriott

By Edward L Miller
Edward L. Miller
Agent of Record
Reg.# 29,331

14 July 2005
(970) 679-3677
Agilent Technologies, Inc.
815 14th St. S.W.
Loveland, Colorado 80537
ELM:elm